



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/596,854	06/27/2006	Frank Bastiaan Brouwer	P16272-US1	1356		
27045	7590	06/12/2008	EXAMINER			
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024				CUMMING, WILLIAM D		
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER				
2617						
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE				
06/12/2008		PAPER				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/596,854	BROUWER, FRANK BASTIAAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	WILLIAM D. CUMMING	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 and 25-40 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 1 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 2-16 and 25-40 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the claimed method steps in claims 2-16; the Code Division Multiple Access (CDMA) system as stated in claims 1 and 25; the base station as stated in claim 25; and all the claimed means in the base station as stated in claims 25 and all the claimed means as stated in claims 35-40 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "*Replacement Sheet*" or "*New Sheet*" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The drawings were received on March 20, 2008. These drawings are approved.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 2-16 and 25-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification inadequately describe the claimed the claimed method steps in claims 2-16; the Code Division Multiple Access (CDMA) system as stated in claims 1 and 25; the base station as stated in claim 25; and all the claimed means in the base station as stated in claims 25 and all the claimed means as stated in claims 35-40. The "*written description*" of the invention required by first paragraph of 35 USC §112 is separate and distinct from that paragraph's requirement of enabling disclosure, since description must do more than merely provide explanation of how to "*make and use*" the invention. Applicant must also convey, with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art, that applicant, as of the filing date sought, was in possession of the invention, with the

invention being, for purpose of "*written description*" inquiry, whatever is presently claimed. Drawings alone may, under proper circumstances, provide "*written description*" of the invention required by 35 USC §112, and whether the drawings are from design application or utility application is not determinative. In order to satisfy "*written description*" requirement of 35 USC §112, the proper test is whether drawings conveys, with reasonable clarity to those of ordinary skill in the art, the claim subject matter.

5. Claims 2-16 and 25-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification does not provide an enabling disclosure the claimed method steps in claims 2-16; the Code Division Multiple Access (CDMA) system as stated in claims 1 and 25; the base station as stated in claim 25; and all the claimed means in the base station as stated in claims 25 and all the claimed means as stated in claims 35-40. The steps are not shown. The means are not shown, the base station is not shown and over all system is not shown. The means that do the steps are not shown. What the node is made of in order to have the claimed means is not disclosed. How the means are interconnected in

the node is not shown. These steps and means are only known by the inventor and are not disclosed to the examiner or the public.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 13 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear if the terms in the parenthesis are part of the claim or not. If the terms are, why the parenthesis?

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed arch 20, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's attorney did not correct or even address some of the rejections and objections of the last Office action.

Enablement requirement of 35 USC 112 is satisfied if the specification contains description that enables one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention (Fiers v. Sugano, 25 USPQ2d 1601). The examiner, in holding that disclosure is not enabling, can rely upon sound scientific reasoning as acceptable alternative to patents and printed publications. Lack of working

examples is not controlling in determining whether disclosure meets enablement requirement of 35 USC § 112. A patent applicant who chooses to forego exemplification and bases utility on broad terminology and general allegations runs risk that, unless one with ordinary skill in art would accept allegations as obviously valid and correct, examiner may properly ask for evidence to substantiate them (Ex parte Sudilovsky, 21 USPQ2d 1702).

Whether the claims do, in fact, set out and circumscribe a particular area with reasonable degree of precision and particularity, definiteness of claim language is analyzed, not in a vacuum, but always in light of the teachings of the prior art and of the particular application disclosure as it would be interpreted by one possessing the ordinary level of skill in the pertinent art (in re Moore, 169 USPQ 236). Reference to the specification disclosure or prior art teachings may make an otherwise definite claim take on an unreasonable degree of uncertainty (In re Cohen, 169 USPQ 45; In re Hammack, 166 USPQ 204; In re Anderson, 176 USPQ 331). If the scope of the invention sought to be patented cannot be determined from the language of the claims, a second paragraph rejection is appropriate (In re Wiggins, 179 USPQ 421).

Information Disclosure Statement

9. The information disclosure statement filed March 20, 2008 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because some reference fail to have a proper date. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claim 1 is allowed.

11. As allowable subject matter has been indicated, applicant's reply must either comply with all formal requirements or specifically traverse each requirement not complied with. See 37 CFR 1.111(b) and MPEP § 707.07(a).

Conclusion

12. If applicants wish to request for an interview, an "*Applicant Initiated Interview Request*" form (PTOL-413A) should be submitted to the examiner prior to the interview in order to permit the examiner to prepare in advance for the interview and to focus on the issues to be discussed. This form should identify the participants of the interview, the proposed date of the interview, whether the interview will be personal, telephonic, or video conference, and should include a brief description of the issues to be discussed. A copy of the completed "*Applicant Initiated Interview Request*" form should be attached to the Interview Summary form, PTOL-413 at the completion of the interview and a copy should be given to applicant or applicant's representative.

13. If applicants request an interview after this **final rejection**, prior to the interview, the intended purpose and content of the interview should be presented briefly, in writing. Such an interview may be granted if the examiner is convinced that disposal or clarification for appeal may be accomplished with only nominal further consideration. Interviews merely to **restate arguments** of record or to **discuss new limitations** which would require more than nominal reconsideration or new search will be denied.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **WILLIAM D. CUMMING** whose telephone number is 571-272-7861. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday- Friday, 11:00am-8:00pm.

15. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost can be reached on 571-272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

16. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/WILLIAM D CUMMING/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2617



UNITED STATES
PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE

WILLIAM CUMMING
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
william.cumming@uspto.gov